

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8

Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Program

Implementation Step 2 Proposals

PIN: 10040
Applicant Name: Los Angeles County Flood Control District
Project Title: Integrated Regional Water Management Step 2 Implementation Grant Proposal

Funds Requested: \$ 25,000,000
Total Project Cost: \$ 112,624,893

Total Proposal Score: 112

Description: This proposal is comprised of 13 priority projects that will deliver a combination of water supply, water quality and other benefits. When implemented, the proposal will develop almost 18,000 AFY of new local water supplies, protect nearly 13,000 AFY existing supplies, promote water conservation, reduce dependence on imported water by approximately 9,000 AFY, create wetlands and parks that also capture and treat 6,000 AFY of stormwater runoff, and restore nearly 100 acres of riparian habitats in multiple locations.

Question: Adopted IRWMP and Proof of Formal Adoption 2

The draft IRWMP is scheduled to be adopted by January 1, 2007.

Question: Description of Region 4

The IRWMP provides numerous maps and a good description of the region including the physical state, county lines, watershed boundaries, and political boundaries. The IRWMP describes water resources in great detail and compares supply versus demand. However, an infrastructure map and more detail on the 20-year plan for water supply and demand are needed. The discrepancy between water supply and water demand over the next 20 years is shown. However, the applicant does not quantify how the gap between water supply and demand would be reduced. The applicant addresses social issues well, but the discussion of the economic and cultural aspects of the region could be improved.

Question: Objectives 3

Regional and water related objectives and the manner in which regional objectives were determined are presented. However, the objectives lack sufficient detail. Most targets have not been quantified and are left vague as indicated by the question marks in the planning target title. The list of quantifiable targets for each objective is being finalized and will reported be included in the final IRWMP.

Question: Water Management Strategies and Integration 4

The applicant describes in sufficient detail the whole range of water management strategies that are currently being utilized in the region. The discussion includes those strategies that are being implemented on a widespread basis and in a limited manner. The applicant further identifies opportunities for expansion of the strategies. However, more specifics on how various water management strategies will be integrated to actually provide reliable water supplies and protect and improve water quality is desirable. A discussion is provided on linkages between projects and the next steps in the IRWMP process, but the linkages are not finalized in the IRWMP.

Question: Priorities and Schedule 5

A concise list of short- and long-term regional priorities is provided and the application presents a good discussion on integrated regional projects and the prioritization process. How the IRWMP will respond to regional changes and how project sequencing may be altered based on responses to implementation are discussed. The applicant describes the stakeholder process used to identify regional priorities and select the 13 projects in the application. The IRWMP discusses responsiveness to regional changes.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Los Angeles County Flood Control District

Question: Implementation

4

The IRWMP identifies on-going technical studies and projects for implementation and also includes a timeline for these projects. Programs, documents, and technical support are summarized in a table. The technical feasibility of proposed projects is well supported by documented studies and reports, but no supporting documents or discussion is provided on economic feasibility. A table depicting funding sources for individual projects is included.

Question: Impacts and Regional Benefits

3

A summary of individual project benefits is presented and consolidated into a discussion of regional benefits. Benefits to DACs within the region are well described. Potential negative impacts from individual projects are identified and mitigation measures are provided. Benefits could have been quantified and benefits and impacts could also have been more strongly supported. Further, discussion of interregional benefits and impacts and evaluation of impacts and benefits to other resources will reportedly be presented in the Final IRWMP.

Question: Technical Analysis and Plan Performance

4

In the IRWMP, the 13 priority projects selected for Step 2 are based on previous technical studies. The IRWMP provides the reports and documents that technically support the program. The IRWMP also includes a discussion on the measures that will be used to evaluate project success. However, data sets and reports necessary to identify data gaps are still undergoing review for inclusion in the final IRWMP. A stronger presentation addressing data gaps would have earned a higher score.

Question: Data Management

5

The IRWMP describes in detail how data will be managed and disseminated through a public website that has been created specifically for the IRWMP and also through regularly scheduled sub-regional and regional stakeholder workshops. A discussion on how data collection will support Statewide Priorities is provided along with an assessment of existing monitoring efforts and an overview of monitoring programs in the region. Collection of data through templates that are compatible with those used in GAMA and SWAMP programs will ensure sharing and integration of data with those programs and prevent duplication of data collection efforts.

Question: Financing

5

The IRWMP identified sources of funding for projects and states that O&M costs have been secured to maintain continuity of projects. It identifies and broadly defines the beneficiaries and identifies the funding and financing plan for implementation. A percentage of potential funding is from grants and assessment fees. O&M funds will come from the general O&M accounts of individual agencies.

Question: Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability

5

This criterion is fully addressed and well documented. The regional objectives, planning targets, and the IRWMP have been developed from and are consistent with existing local planning documents. The IRWMP directly implements elements of 34 local plans which include General Plans, basin plans, watershed master plans, TMDL plans, UWMP, greenway master plans and water recycling master plans. Coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers is very well demonstrated through active participation and involvement of relevant agencies within the region in the stakeholder process. The dynamics between the IRWMP and local planning documents is facilitated through the stakeholder process, which allows for interactive feedback to occur between local and regional planning, and is very well documented.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Los Angeles County Flood Control District

Question: Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination

4

The IRWMP presents a long list of stakeholders. A structured arrangement for stakeholder involvement at both local and regional levels and mechanisms and processes used to facilitate involvement and communication is well described. Discussion is provided on how stakeholders participate and influence decisions at various levels in the planning process. Outreach activities specific to individual groups are documented. Coordination with State and federal agencies is apparent and well described, but specific areas where they could assist are not yet identified. Although special outreach has been made to leaders of EJ groups, EJ concerns are not discussed. A more comprehensive discussion on EJ issues would have warranted a higher score.

Weighted IRWMP Total Score: 24

Question: Work Plan

12

The proposal has a mix of projects including recycling and conservation; watershed and storm water improvements; wetland, habitat, and creek fish restoration; and spreading grounds and groundwater recharge. Work plans provide an overview with well presented goals and objectives, current status of the 13 proposed projects, and a map of project locations. Linkages and synergies between projects are discussed. Status of CEQA and various permits are discussed. The plans and specifications submitted are consistent with design tasks listed in the work plan. A few projects (such as, Morris Dam Enhancement and the Large Landscape Conservation) need more explanation to understand the work that is planned.

Question: Budget

3

A summary budget for the proposal is included, as are individual project budgets. The project budgets, work plan, and schedule generally agree. Supporting documentation for some of the budget categories lack detail, budgets do not include a breakdown of labor costs, and labor costs for construction administration are generally not provided. Some projects have a high contingency and some impact analysis activities costs and mitigation expenses do not appear to be included.

Question: Funding Match

5

The funding match is 77% of the total proposal costs.

Question: Schedule

4

All projects are scheduled to begin construction by December 1, 2007. The status of pre-construction work items is present; three of 13 projects have all work items completed and all preconstruction work items are scheduled be obtained by October 2007. Each project has been individually addressed in detail including a discussion of the items that are going to be accomplished before and after the deadline. All Gantt charts are detailed enough to demonstrate that will be kept on track to meet the deadlines specified. However, the schedules do not consistently show that the projects will be monitored or evaluated after implementation to determine if they are meeting the original intent of the project.

Question: Scientific and Technical Merit

12

A table of references and accompanying explanation for each project provide the scientific and technical basis. The information contained in the relevant documents supports the feasibility for each project. However, the work plans for Projects 2, 11, and 13 do not clearly indicate that they will fill data gaps. Also, reference to current cost estimates and better quantification of restoration efforts would have provided better technical support for those projects.

Question: Monitoring, Assessment and Performance Measures

4

Project performance tables include goals, outcome indicators, output indicators, measurement tools, and methods. The narrative descriptions of outcome indicators are more substantive than is presented in the Project Performance Tables. Output indicators, as described in narrative form, may track projects' performance. However, it is difficult to determine if some project's target can be met given they are still undergoing development and not depicted in performance tables (e.g. projects 1 and 11).

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Los Angeles County Flood Control District

Question: Economic Analysis

12

The water supply and water quality benefits realized through the implementation of the proposal would be high. Reported water supply (\$576 million) and quality (\$47 million) benefits far exceed costs (\$150 million), but the dollar benefits are likely exaggerated and benefits calculations contain errors. Total quantified water supply augmentation would be about 31,000 AF. The projects in the proposal have a relatively low unit cost for water production. Stormwater quality benefits are also likely and add to the economically strong water supply projects.

Question: Other Expected Benefits

8

This criterion is sufficiently addressed and explained from a mix of projects with benefits stated for: 1) creek, stream bed, riparian and wetland habitat, and wildlife protection and restoration; 2) various recreation, aesthetics, and educational opportunities; and 3) energy savings. There should be significant net benefits to fish and wildlife, including 29 acres of wetlands and 63.5 acres of riparian habitat. Additional project specific detail is needed for various issues including: 1) management and maintenance of easement lands and agency held lands and 2) impacts to fish and wildlife resources involving species surveys, impact analysis, mitigation and compensation, and monitoring. Qualitative and some quantitative information describing the Other Expected Benefits derivable from the proposal is provided, but is not fully backed by supporting documentation.

Question: Program Preferences

4

The proposed projects are diverse in nature providing multiple benefits. The proposal includes projects that implement all but one of the Program Preferences. Satisfactory documentation is provided for the breadth and magnitude of the preferences to be implemented. However, of the 13 projects, only 6 are classified as having a high level of certainty in meeting their claimed benefits. The other projects have a medium level of certainty.

Question: Statewide Priorities

24

The applicant documents how each individual project will achieve various Statewide Priorities. Projects collectively address 7 of 8 Statewide Priorities with major focus on WMI, TMDLs, WMI, the NPS plan, and EJ concerns. The projects that address TMDLs, WMI, and Water Quality Objectives appear to have a high level of certainty and include efforts to achieve major reductions in TMDLs in the region. The magnitude and significance of the priorities the proposal will meet is well documented. The applicant claims that the projects will reduce export demand. However, reduction in export is unlikely since water demand is much greater than the current 2030 estimate for the region. Water supply conflicts over groundwater and recharge need to be addressed.

Total Proposal Score:	112
------------------------------	------------